

## REMARKS

Claims 1 through 36 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated September 9, 2004, claims 1 through 36 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address Examiner's comments below.

Applicants herein amend claims 9, 18, 27, and 36. No claims are deleted or added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making this amendment, Applicants have not and do not narrow the scope of the protection to which Applicants consider the claimed invention to be entitled and do not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seek to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above Amendment and Remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

### Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1 through 36 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,546,417 to Baker ("Baker"). This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a "method for reformatting messages for multiple display environments," where the method comprises:

determining provision of a user interface including a message display area having a first format that includes a first display parameter; receiving a message for introduction into the user interface, the message having a second format that differs from the first format such that introduction of the message unmodified would produce a misalignment according to the first display parameter; automatically reformatting the message to provide a reformatted message that corresponds with the first format; and providing a display of the reformatted message within the user interface, wherein the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter.

The claimed invention beneficially provides automatic reformatting of a message.

Thus, the claimed invention automatically reformats a message to provide compatibility with interfaces and databases having formats that differ from the message's format. This beneficially allows a user to introduce a received message into an interface or database without substantially editing the received message to make it compatible with an interface or database's format.

The cited reference, Baker, does not disclose the claimed invention. Baker discloses an “[e]lectronic mail client software ha[ving] a mailbox display which lists messages together with an icon for each message where the icon is associated with the MIME type of the message.” (Baker, Abstract). The electronic mail client software of Baker has a primary function to provide “an inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached documents are displayed with different kinds of icons.” (*Id.*, 4:62-64). In particular,

The mailbox display component . . . includes the functionality of looking to a directory of icons for display with information about the message based on the MIME type of the message. . . . [A] data structure is created for each message with an additional TYPE field that is based on the MIME type and subtype of the message. The internal TYPE field is used to associate MIME type to icons. Another embodiment uses the contents of “content-type” (MIME type) header of the message directly to associate with icon images. If there is no appropriate icon in the directory of icons, the mailbox display uses

icon image data contained in a subpart of the MIME message if it is available. Otherwise, no icon or a generic icon is used.

*Id.*, 5:32-46.

As can be seen, Baker merely discloses displaying, in an electronic mail client, an icon that indicates an electronic message's type. Baker fails to disclose "receiving a message for introduction into the user interface, the message having a second format that differs from the first format such that introduction of the message unmodified would produce a misalignment according to the first display parameter" as Applicants claim. In fact, Baker only discloses an electronic mail client that receives electronic messages. There is no disclosure of introducing a received electronic message to another user interface having a format different from the electronic message's format.

Furthermore, Baker fails to disclose "automatically reformatting the message to provide a reformatted message that corresponds with the first format" as Applicants claim. The claimed invention automatically reformats a message according to a user interface's display parameter (e.g., a line length or a maximum number of display lines). For example, the message may be automatically reformatted to correspond with the user interface's format such that introduction of the message into the user interface would not result in individual words splitting across different lines or longer lines displaying as an erratic series of full and truncated lines. In contrast, Baker merely discloses various ways to form an icon associated with an electronic message and to display the icon in the electronic mail client. Such icon formation and display do not disclose the claimed invention because the content of the electronic message in Baker is never automatically reformatted. Baker thus does not provide the benefit of the claimed invention because Baker does not allow a user to introduce a

received message into an interface or database without substantially editing the received message to make it compatible with the interface or database's format.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Baker does not disclose Applicants' claimed invention so that claim 1 is now patentably distinguishable. Likewise, claim 2, which depends directly from claim 1, recites additional patentable features of the claimed invention. Hence, the arguments made above also apply to claim 2. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1, as well as claim 2, and request allowance of these claims.

With respect to claim 3, the claimed invention further recites that "the first display parameter is a line length and the second display parameter is a maximum number of display lines." As already noted at length, Baker does not disclose "automatically reformatting the message to provide a reformatted message that corresponds with the first format" as Applicants claim. Nor does Baker disclose any derivation as Applicants claim.

The citation by Examiner to column 10, lines 15 to 44 in Baker, merely references a mailbox display line indicating the properties of an electronic message such as the message subject, the date, the sender's name, and the graphical elements. There is no disclosure of a "line length" and a "maximum number of display lines" as recited in claim 3. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 3, as well as allowance of the claim.

With respect to claims 4 through 8, as noted above, the claimed "line length" and "maximum number of display lines" are not disclosed in Baker. Furthermore, Baker fails to disclose automatically reformatting a message according to a message display area's line

length and maximum number of display lines. The citation by Examiner to Baker merely references various ways to display an icon associated with an electronic message. In contrast, the claimed invention automatically reformats a message itself to correspond with a user interface's format. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 4 through 8 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 4 through 8, as well as allowance of these claims.

Claim 9, as amended, recites that "the user interface is included in a network based customer service system and the reformatted message is saved in a database used by the network based customer service system." Applicants submit that Baker fails to disclose a network based customer service system. The citation by Examiner to column 9, lines 15 to 67 in Baker, merely references displaying an icon particular to an email message's attachment. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 9 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 9, as well as allowance of the claim.

Applicants submit that the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 through 9, also apply to claims 10 through 36, and the arguments made therein are incorporated by reference. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 through 36 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, as well as allowance of these claims.

### Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 through 36, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference (including the reference cited, but not

applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejection to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Christopher A. Johns and Peter R. Kolbus

Date: 9 December 2004 By:



Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 39,327  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: rpatel@fenwick.com